

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
10

11 BRYAN B. BONHAM,

12 Plaintiff(s),

13 v.

14 ROMERO ARANAS, et al.,

15 Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:17-cv-02398-RFB-NJK

ORDER

[Docket Nos. 42, 51]

16 Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion demanding an inspection for fraud on the
17 Court. Docket No. 42. Defendants filed a response. Docket No. 42. No reply was filed. Also
18 pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to supplement his earlier motion. Docket No. 51.
19 Defendants filed a response, Docket No. 59, and Plaintiff filed a reply, Docket No. 61. The
20 motions are properly resolved without a hearing. *See* Local Rule 78-1.

21 As to the motion to supplement (Docket No. 51) the earlier motion, that is **GRANTED** and
22 the Court will consider the information provided therein in ruling on the underlying motion
23 demanding an inspection for fraud on the Court.

24 Although not entirely clear, Plaintiff's motion and subsequent filings are premised on his
25 assertions that various positions advanced by Defendants in different filings are false. *See* Docket
26 No. 42 at 4-6 (addressing the answer, a response to a motion to amend, and responses to requests
27 for admission). Plaintiff also asserts that the Court's denial of his motion to compel discovery has
28 prejudiced his ability to advance this case. *See* Docket No. 61 at 4.

1 The case law cited by Plaintiff provides for contempt-like ancillary proceedings when a
2 litigant's misconduct renders the "judicial machinery [unable to] perform in the usual manner."
3 See *Cobell v. Norton*, 226 F. Supp. 2d 1, 24 (D.D.C. 2002) (quoting *Transaero v. La Fuerza Area*
4 *Boliviana*, 24 F.3d 457, 460 (2d Cir. 1994)), *vacated*, 334 F.3d 1128 (D.C. Cir. 2003). Plaintiff
5 has not shown that the normal adversarial process is insufficient to address the issues he has raised.
6 To the extent Plaintiff disagrees with Defendants' denials as to the allegations in this case, he may
7 attempt to prove otherwise at trial. To the extent Plaintiff disagrees with a position advanced in a
8 brief, he may explain that disagreement in his own briefing. To the extent Plaintiff disagrees with
9 discovery responses, he may seek appropriate relief under the governing rules. To the extent
10 Plaintiff disagrees with the rulings of the Court, he may seek appropriate relief under the governing
11 rules.¹ The Court declines to institute a parallel proceeding by which Plaintiff can notify the Court
12 of his various disagreements with Defendants' positions or the Court's rulings.

13 Accordingly, the motion demanding an inspection for fraud on the Court (Docket No. 42)
14 is **DENIED**.

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: August 21, 2019

17
18 
19 _____
20 Nancy J. Koppe
21 United States Magistrate Judge
22
23
24
25
26

27 ¹ Plaintiff separately moved the Court to reconsider its order denying without prejudice his
28 motion to compel. Docket No. 53. The Court is denying that motion to reconsider through a
separate order issued concurrently herewith.